



DRAFT
MEETING SUMMARY
SEATTLE FERRY TERMINAL PROJECT
COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP #2
SEATTLE FERRY TERMINAL, PIER 52
SPIKE EIKUM ROOM
AUGUST 2, 2006
5:00 – 8:00 P.M.

Note: This meeting summary represents notes from the Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting, and is not a formal transcript or minutes. It is provided for the information of CAG members and other interested parties.

Meeting Attendees

CAG Members

- Frank Madigan (for Bob Donegan, Ivar's)
- Darrell Bryan
- Jo Thompson
- John Blackman
- John DeLanoy
- Michael Berk
- Mike Sudduth
- Roger Ottenbach
- Conrad Plyler
- Gary Dawson
- Joan Dingfield
- John Hoffman
- Heather Trim (for Kathy Fletcher, People for Puget Sound)
- Michael Atkins
- Paul Topper
- Todd Vogel

WSF Staff and Project Team

- Mike Anderson
- Hadley Greene
- Ray Deardorf
- Angela Freudenstein
- Walt Niehoff
- Bob Swope
- Mike Reid
- Tim King
- Leonard Smith
- Celia Schorr
- Bill Greene
- Jim Cade
- Marcia Wagoner
- Joe Quintana

Other Attendees

- Becca Aue, SDOT
- Robert Scully, DPD

Meeting Overview – Marcia Wagoner, Meeting Facilitator, PRR

Marcia Wagoner, Meeting Facilitator from PRR, welcomed and thanked the Community Advisory Group (CAG) members for their continued participation with the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project. She reviewed the public comment process and stated that the meeting was intended to focus on the CAG; however, public participation was appreciated and encouraged. Comment cards were made available to the public and a public response period was held at the end of the meeting.



Marcia then walked the CAG through the meeting agenda and offered brief introductions of the meeting's featured speakers. Prior to beginning the presentations, Marcia suggested that the CAG members reintroduce themselves and briefly state their affiliations and/or interests.

- John Blackman is a Partner with Argosy Cruises.
- Darrell Bryan is the Executive Vice President and General Manager of Clipper Navigation, Inc.
- John DeLanoy is a member of the Pioneer Square Preservation Board and a ferry commuter.
- Roger Ottenbach lives in Port Orchard and is a Southworth ferry commuter, Pioneer Square business owner, and a member of the Downtown Seattle Association's Viaduct Task Force.
- Heather Trim (on behalf of Kathy Fletcher) is a representative for People for Puget Sound.
- Michael Berk is a Bainbridge Island resident and a daily bicycle commuter.
- Frank Madigan (on behalf of Bob Donegan) represents Ivar's, which owns Pier 54 and is a long-standing neighbor of the Seattle Ferry Terminal.
- Conrad Plyler is a Southworth ferry commuter and member of the Southworth Ferry Advisory Committee.
- Gary Dawson is a resident of West Seattle and the Chair of the Fauntleroy Ferry Advisory Committee.
- Mike Sudduth is a Vashon Island Ferry Commuter and member of the Vashon Island Ferry Advisory Committee.
- Joan Dingfield is a Bremerton resident and a member of the Bremerton Ferry Advisory Committee.
- John Hoffman is a member of the Seattle Design Commission.
- Paul Topper is a Bainbridge Island resident, as well as a member of the Bainbridge Island Ferry Advisory Committee and the Bainbridge Island Ferry Terminal Improvement Project CAG.
- Jo Thompson is the President of the Pioneer Square Community Association and the General Manager of the Best Western Pioneer Square.
- Todd Vogel is member of Allied Arts of Seattle.
- Michael Atkins is a member of Feet First, a pedestrian advocacy group in Seattle.

Marcia requested that WSF project staff and other attendees introduce themselves by stating their names and organizations that they represent.

- Mike Reid is with PRR participating in the public involvement process related to the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project.
- Becca Aue is with the Seattle Department of Transportation.
- Robert Scully is an Urban Designer with the City Design, City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development.
- Joe Quintana is the Managing Partner of the Index Group, a Seattle-based public affairs consulting group.
- Leonard Smith is the WSF Seattle Ferry Terminal Operations Design and Construction Manager.
- Angela Freudenstein is an Environmental Manager with WSF.
- Bob Swope is a Senior Environmental Planner with CH2M Hill.
- Walt Niehoff is a Partner with LMN Architects.
- Jim Cade is a Principal with LMN Architects.



- Tim King is the WSF Seattle Ferry Terminal Project Manager.
- Ray Deardorf is the WSF Planning Director.
- Hadley Greene is the WSF Community Relations and Public Outreach Manager.
- Bill Greene is the WSF Program Development (Budget) Director.
- Mike Anderson (arrived later in the meeting) is the WSF Executive Director.

Prior Meeting Recap and Clarifications – Marcia Wagoner

Marcia acknowledged a request from the CAG during the previous meeting for more project background information and said various links and articles had been e-mailed to CAG members prior to the meeting. These items included:

- City of Seattle's Central Waterfront Plan
- Allied Arts Waterfront Plan
- Multi-modal Transit Workshop Summary
- Vehicular Workshop Summary
- Environmental Workshop Summary

In the previous meeting, CAG members identified various underlying interests for the project that should guide the CAG process. These project goals from the CAG perspective included:

- Develop project with timelessness in mind
- Address existing and foreseeable issues
- Establish ways to uphold and support efficiency in process
- Maintain rationale for the completion of a "good" project.
- Maintain open lines of communication – dialogue with constituent communities & groups.
- Coordinate with other agencies
- Build consensus
- Establish areas for compromise
- Communicate all CAG perspectives to the community at large

Marcia stressed the importance of the CAG and its critical role in providing project insight to the community at large. She asked the group if the CAG goals were still accurate, and the group agreed.

During the last meeting the group identified specific components and elements of the project that they would like to hear more about in subsequent meetings. Marcia informed the group that their request was heard, and that this evening's meeting was structured to address some of those items. These included:

- What steps have been taken to date, related to the project process?
- Provide information on the project's budget and funding sources.
- Identify ways and examples of how other agencies have been involved in the process thus far.
- Identify critical points, key dates, and decisions that need to be made with respect to the project timeframe.

Marcia directed the CAG's attention to two project timelines which were created to identify critical path dates and key milestones as related to the decision making process. Of note, she mentioned the EIS process and the dates associated with this



critical project component. With that, Marcia introduced Bob Swope to provide detail on the Purpose and Need Statement and the EIS process.

Purpose and Need Statement and the Environmental Impact Statement – Bob Swope, Senior Environmental Planner, CH2M Hill

Bob began his presentation by stating the importance of getting the project off on the right foot, and that begins with the Environmental Impact Statement. The EIS is a very early step in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. Because federal funds are contributing to the project, a NEPA (as opposed to SEPA) EIS is required. One of the first steps within the EIS is the Purpose and Need (P&N) Statement, which is the statement by which all the project alternatives will be evaluated. The purpose, as identified in the P&N, is driven by identifying some of the problems and issues which Colman Dock is currently facing. Bob then referred to the "Project Objectives" display to illustrate the P&N process. He referenced several critical reasons for why the project is needed, and again noted that the needs drive the purpose of the project. Some of the project needs include:

- Dock is constructed on damaged or deteriorated timber pilings.
- Terminal has insufficient capacity to accommodate growth in vehicles and passengers.
- Multi-modal connections are inadequate to meet current or future demand.

The purpose, as noted, focuses on improving the existing Seattle Ferry Terminal at Colman Dock to ensure that it will continue to meet future ridership demands.

Project purposes include:

- Replace the aging and deteriorating dock structures, slip foundations, and transfer spans.
- Accommodate growth projected by the WSF Draft Long-Range Strategic Plan by enhancing terminal operational and system efficiencies.
- Provide ferry passengers with safe and convenient access to multiple modes of transportation.

Bob mentioned that the P&N is the cornerstone for the development of design alternatives and that its accuracy is imperative. If the scope of the P&N is too broad, the project runs the risk of having to analyze too many alternatives and, likewise, if the scope is too narrow the project may not be able to study a range of alternatives.

Bob also noted that a new regulation passed in August 2005 now dictates the structure of the project in several ways. Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) was enacted to establish federal resources and opportunities to advance highway safety in a comprehensive and strategic manner. SAFETEA-LU also provides a new avenue of federal funding for transportation projects. Since the Seattle Ferry Terminal project will receive federal funding, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are co-leads for the project. WSF is the project sponsor. The co-leads have the responsibility to finalize the P&N and share it with other agencies of interest and the public for comment.

A draft P&N was developed and shown to agencies and the public during the scoping period in spring 2006. The comments received are being incorporated into a revised document. To conclude, Bob directed the CAG's attention back to the "Project



Objectives” display and noted that of the P&N also includes other WSF objectives such as:

- Increased revenue from sources other than fare-box revenue.
- Enhance security to meet Homeland Security requirements.

While these objectives are not primary purposes of the project, they represent other areas that WSF intends to fold into the project.

Comments and Questions

- Joan Dingfield asked if the CAG will have a chance to cover the environmental elements depicted on the timeline. Yes.

Marcia then introduced Tim King to briefly recap the multi-agency workshops, held in spring 2006 to address multi-modal transit, vehicular, and environmental elements of the project.

Recap of Multi-Agency Workshops – Tim King, Project Manager, WSF and Jim Cade, Project Manager, LMN Architects

Tim reiterated that the P&N is possibly the most important document related to the project. He commented on the importance of correctly completing this document from the beginning, since any identified deficiencies will require starting the process all over from the beginning.

Comments and Questions

- Todd Vogel asked when the revised P&N will be completed and ready for review. *An early draft is already on the project website and WSF will send out a copy to the CAG members once the preliminary final is approved.*
- John Hoffman asked how mixed-use and co-development figure in to the P&N and whether this will be a developed alternative. *This will be part of the alternatives developed, but the degree of co-development that will be included in the EIS is unclear at this point.*

In late 2004, LMN Architects began collecting published studies and previously completed reports to develop a comprehensive background of the Seattle Ferry Terminal and the Seattle waterfront. Roughly half of the information that was collected had previously been summarized, so LMN worked to summarize the remaining material and revise all collected information. This process highlighted the complexity of the project and identified that this facility is, first and foremost, a transportation facility.

Recognizing the importance of agency involvement with this project, a series of workshops was initiated to elicit feedback, opinions, and impressions related to key elements of the project. The project team also recognized that there would not be enough money available to incorporate every desire for this project, and the process of alternatives development would need to be transparent.

The team identified four primary project drivers as the “DNA” of the project. These elements include:

- Transportation
- Environment



- Economic
- Urban Design

These topics were combined into three workshops. Since these workshops were held before the project scoping period, they are background information and will be used to help the team focus on developing alternatives. The workshops conducted were:

- Transportation– Focus on traffic impacts; attendees included WSDOT and WSF staff.
- Urban Design and Economic – Focus on issues related to land use regulations; attendees included various City and WSF staff.
- Environmental – Focus on environmental issues; attendees included mostly City environmental staff.

Tim said that as the project evolves, the CAG and its members are strongly encouraged to offer ideas if it appears that WSF has missed anything. Screening criteria are being developed right now and will be used for the development of alternatives to make sure that all project elements and components are addressed.

Walt Niehoff, LMN Architects, then commented that the “DNA” of the project that was previously mentioned was developed to be carried throughout the life of the project.

Tim then introduced Jim Cade, who continued with the recap of the multi-agency workshops. The Multi-modal Workshop was the first held in this second series, and occurred on January 31, 2006. Jim then referenced the “Multi-modal Workshop” display board that was presented to the CAG, and walked the members through the points documented on the board. A copy of this display board was provided to each CAG for their binders.

- Workshop attendees included: Seattle Department of Transportation, Seattle Department of Planning and Development, Washington State Ferries, King County Metro, Sound Transit, Washington State Department of Transportation, Puget Sound Regional Council

Comments and Questions

- Joan Dingfield mentioned that after reviewing the workshop summary notes, it seemed as though Metro felt that ferry passengers were not interested in using the bus. Metro noted that buses often leave the terminal half-full. She inquired as to whether or not Metro’s thinking has since shifted? *Many participant opinions prior to the workshop were considerably different than those held after the workshop.*
- Joan Dingfield also commented that through work on other projects, she has encountered issues with Metro’s need to balance urban and rural routes. She wondered whether this may become a factor with this project.

The Environmental Workshop occurred on March 14, 2006. Jim referenced the “Environmental Workshop” display board that was presented to the CAG, and walked members through the points documented on the board. A copy of this display board was provided to each of the CAG members for their binders.

- Workshop attendees included: Seattle Department of Transportation, Washington State Ferries, Port of Seattle, Suquamish Tribe, Muckleshoot



Tribe, Seattle Design Commission, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Ecology, King County, Metro, City of Seattle Public Utilities, City Light, Department of Planning and Development

Comments and Questions

- Heather Trim inquired about the possibility of adding a Human Health and Education category as one of the components of the project "DNA". *This category is lumped under the existing Urban Design category.*
- John Blackman pointed out that coordinating all participating agencies and developing consensus is a daunting task. He inquired about whether there were any successful approaches in dealing with this challenge. *Creating one universal transportation agency might make things easier, but that is not for us to determine. He (Tim) noted that we are where we are, and that the system that exists is the one from which we have to work.*
- Darrell Bryan cited Metro in Portland as an example of one collective transportation agency that seems to work well.

The Vehicular Workshop occurred on April 27, 2006. Jim referenced the display board that was presented to the CAG, and walked members through the points documented on the board. A copy of this display board was provided to each of the CAG members for their binders. Jim noted that this workshop was intended to develop strategies for mitigating the impact of congestion on the City streets and referenced each graphic on the board to illustrate themes. Jim told the group that the issue of whether to redirect the Southworth route into downtown is not the key issue; Colman Dock will see the biggest growth of any terminal in the system, with or without Southworth. He also mentioned that Colman Dock has significant infrastructure improvements which are needed to address existing vehicle demands at the terminal.

- Workshop attendees included: Seattle Department of Transportation, Washington State Ferries, Seattle Design Commission, Metro, Seattle Department of Planning and Development, Alaska Way Viaduct Project Team

Comments and Questions

- Michael Berk asked about the possibility of redeveloping Pier 48 for the creation of a Metro transportation center. He asked if Metro had a chance to evaluate this as a possibility. *Metro was involved in the workshop and will consider all options.*
- John Hoffman questioned the viability of the proposed options, as provided on the display board. He then asked if certain alternatives have been ruled out at this point. *Screening criteria are being developed right now and each alternative will be assessed appropriately through the EIS process.*
- Joan Dingfield noted an interest in being able to weigh-in on the various options once they have been screened.
- Leonard Smith provided that it is equally important to focus on both entrance and exit patterns of vehicles to and from the dock.
- Conrad Plyler mentioned that Southworth commuters are interested in getting off the dock and out of the City center once they arrive at Colman Dock. He also noted that many commuters from his community prefer using Fauntleroy since many work closer to West Seattle.



- Michael Berk mentioned that he bikes south from Colman Dock every day and that existing traffic congestion makes this type of commute very dangerous. He inquired about any potential ideas in place to help address these conditions. *(Leonard) has dealt with this issue as a member of the Bainbridge Island Master Plan Design Team. He said that WSF currently views bicycles as part of the car traffic and that this mode of transportation needs to be categorized as its own entity.*
- Becca Aue asked about the assumptions behind the projected increased demand in ferry service. She mentioned that TDM measures, better transit, and fluctuation in fares could significantly impact the number of vehicles using the ferry system.

Upon reconvening after a short break Marcia introduced Hadley Greene and Angela Freudenstein to discuss the public scoping process.

What Have We Heard So Far from the Public? – Hadley Greene, Community Relations and Public Outreach Manager, WSF and Angela Freudenstein, Environmental Manager, WSF

Hadley began by stating that two public meetings were held as part of the environmental scoping period, which ended on May 19, 2006. A total of 178 comments were received, and summaries of these comments were provided to the CAG members during the first meeting. Another round of public meetings will be held to present the draft alternatives. Hadley stated that WSF has also conducted briefings and presentations with the Seattle City Council, Seattle Design Commission, Pioneer Square Community Association, Waterfront Partners Group, tribes, and various other stakeholders. She noted that of the public comments received, many focused on the views related to the terminal and how views from the City and of the water could be improved. Hadley then introduced Angela to discuss agency comments received during the scoping period.

Angela stated that various agencies and tribes were included in the scoping process, and that their feedback was substantial and beneficial. Most agencies did not provide written comments and the majority of the comments that were provided focused primarily on the following topics:

- Purpose & Need Statement
- SAFETEA-LU
- Impacts on the Bainbridge Island system
- Consistency of co-development with land use codes
- Impacts to the shoreline, views, air quality, stormwater, emergency responders, construction activities
- Minimizing aquatic impacts

Angela noted that the agency comments have been summarized and included with the public scoping comments. She also stated that the Preliminary Final Draft P&N is being finalized and will be reviewed with the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to make sure that all identified issues have sufficiently been addressed.

Comments and Questions

- John Hoffman noticed that particular comments raised during scoping were not represented or addressed on the workshop display boards. He asked



when these comments would be addressed and when consensus would be built. *The workshops were conducted prior to the scoping process, so scoping comments were not discussed at the workshops.*

Marcia then introduced Bill Greene to provide an overview of the project budget and funding sources associated with the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project.

Project Budget and Funding Overview – Bill Greene, Program Development Director, WSF and Tim King

Bill began by offering a brief overview of WSF and where the agency's funding sources originate. He stated that WSF is part of WSDOT and that the agency's budget is dictated by the legislative process. Approximately five percent of the total WSDOT budget is appropriated to WSF. To fund each project, WSF develops a project list to guide the allocation of legislative funds, which are appropriated biennially.

Bill noted that approximately 90 percent of WSF's capital budget is designated for preservation. He reiterated that Colman Dock is the busiest and oldest facility in the system and that this facility also possesses the third lowest life-cycle rating in the system. After Initiative 695 passed the WSF capital program was largely left unfunded. As such, WSF has had to operate under significant financial constraints to rely on the transfer of gas taxes and vehicle fees from the Motor Vehicle Account for operational assistance. Bill also stressed the financial demands placed on the system by material costs, fuel costs, inflation, and construction in China and India.

Comments and Questions

- Heather Trim asked if the appropriated funding, as identified on the budget/funding overview board, is able to be moved around throughout various biennium periods. As an example, she cited that the bulk of the funding allocated for this project is shown between 2009 and 2013. She asked if it would be possible to move some of this money up. *All WSF's project needs have been prioritized and a very rough order of magnitude exists. Moving money around would affect other projects outside of the Seattle Ferry Terminal Project. While not impossible, it would be very difficult to move the legislative funding around.*
- Joan Dingfield questioned whether the \$230 million project budget includes federal funding or outside/alternative sources of funding. *WSF has looked at funding from a number of different outside sources. Obtaining federal funding has been successful, with \$5.8 million granted through SAFETEA-LU. WSF is also exploring other grant funding opportunities*
- Joan then asked if agencies such as Metro are able to provide funding for the project. *WSF feels that the more partners drawn to the project, the more opportunity exists for additional sources of funding.*
- Darrell Bryan noted that extensive competition exists for federal funds. The process of securing federal funding is competitive.
- Todd Vogel asked if the budget and funding timeline presented on the display board represented present value and if inflation has been accounted for with the estimates. *All costs are in inflated dollars.*



Tim then told the CAG which elements of the project will receive the allocated funding. He explained the "Budget Overview" display. He said the Marine Facilities will receive an estimated \$92 million to address the following issues:

- Preserve the north trestle, including pavement and retained fill
- Preserve existing towers, bridge seats, transfer spans, aprons, overhead loading structures, dolphins, exit gates, bulkheads, and riprap
- Improve access for passengers with limited mobility

The Terminal Building is the second primary component of the project, and \$48 million has been allocated for the reconstruction and expansion of the main terminal building. The South Trestle Expansion is estimated to cost \$75 million and will comprise expanding the existing South Trestle to increase vehicle holding capacity. Tim also noted that approximately \$3 million has been allocated for utility improvements.

Tim reiterated that these costs all represent estimates and that as the project progresses, feasibility and cost will continue to become clearer. He also stated that value engineering will continue throughout the project, which will offer checks and a chance to implement cost effective measures. Tim noted that the project will utilize the State's CVEP process of bringing in outside experts, not vested in the project, to provide an analysis of critical project elements such as time, cost, and feasibility. He commented on the importance of realizing that the funding information presented to the CAG simply represents the first cut and that the budget and funding allocation will vary based on engineering estimates.

Process Timeline Overview/Critical Path Dates – Tim King

Tim utilized two timeline display boards to present critical path dates and project milestones. He began by directing attention to the timeline that covers the period from 2006 through 2016 and pointing out six primary phases:

- Planning
- Environmental
- Design
- Permitting
- Phased Construction
- Public Involvement

Tim added that marine projects always require phased construction because of environmental mandates designate that all in-water work must occur between July 15th and February 15th. Tim also pointed out that there is a certain level of overlap among some of the project phases.

The 2006-2010 timeline was then referenced to help explain critical dates and the project's near-term milestones.

The Draft EIS will be released in 2008. Tim commented that while this may seem like a long time, the national average for similar projects is 54 months and this project is 3.8 years. Tim said that preliminary design will occur during the environmental phase. The shoreline process was also incorrectly depicted on the timeline, and will likely begin several month after it has been shown on the display.



Comments and Questions

- Mike Sudduth asked if WSF will be updating the schedule periodically, to account for changes that occur within the project process. *WSF will keep a revised and up-to-date timeline and project schedule available for the CAG.*
- Heather Trim asked if speeding up the environmental process was a possibility, and whether or not the project team, is able to speed up specific documents. *The number of federal reviews associated with the project and coordinating with so many agencies is time-consuming. WSF is currently engaged in discussions with the federal co-leads regarding the feasibility of overlapping reviews.*
- Heather noted that the Bremerton Transportation Center project had a much shorter review process. *This project was a SEPA EIS, which requires far less time for the review process than NEPA.*
- Roger Ottenbach inquired about how the project will work with the Alaskan Way Viaduct project since the AWV construction is expected to begin in 2009 and Colman Dock will still be in the environmental process. *Coordination will be a challenge, but WSF is working closely with the AWV team to address such issues.*
- Darrell Bryan mentioned how critical it is that these projects occur in sync with one another. Roger Ottenbach stated that WSF and AWV need to make sure that the projects are well-coordinated. *Mike Anderson noted that both AWV and Colman Dock are WSDOT projects and that WSF is working continuously to make sure that proactive coordination occurs.*
- Joan Dingfield asked if an EIS will be required for the entire Seattle waterfront process. *There will be but it has not yet been scheduled. The Seattle Ferry Terminal Project EIS will not be impeded by the waterfront EIS.*
- John Hoffman asked about air rights, and where this issue fits in on the timeline. *This issue will be addressed with the comprehensive plan amendment which should occur by the end of the year. The next step will be to change the land use code.*
- Michael Berk asked about the CAG's responsibilities and wanted to know more about what WSF sees as the most valuable contributions from the CAG.
- Joe Quintana mentioned that the comprehensive plan amendment is permissive and stated that obtaining the requested comprehensive plan changes this year is critical.

CAG Feedback and Discuss Work Plan – Marcia Wagoner

Marcia began this segment of the meeting stating that the CAG work plan will coincide with the critical path dates and key milestones provided on the two timeline displays. She noted that screening criteria for the development of design alternatives is being developed right now, and that this will serve as an important item of discussion for a future CAG meeting.

She noted that the next CAG meeting will be in October. The next meeting will provide the opportunity to address any topics that the CAG would like covered, and that WSF is always open to holding meetings with smaller groups if this is desired. Marcia then requested feedback from the CAG to further develop a satisfactory work plan and meeting schedule.

Comments and Questions

- Mike Sudduth asked if materials will be made available for review prior to the October CAG meeting. Yes.
- Joan Dingfield inquired about the possibility of taking a boat trip to see the terminal from the water. *By a show of hands, the CAG unanimously supported this idea.*
- John Hoffman asked how many alternatives will be developed for January. *At least three, and possibly five, will be developed. WSF needs to test the extremes in order to mix and match concepts that will be combined into a preferred alternative.*
- Todd Vogel mentioned that the media could skew the perspective regardless of how the alternatives are presented.
- Conrad Plyler added that if WSF presents the extremes at the open house, those most inclined to participate in the event will be those who are vehemently opposed to certain elements of the proposed alternatives. He suggested that boundaries are established and that a middle ground is reached.
- Walt Niehoff commented that all project ideas must be grounded in economic reality.
- Bob Swope then clarified the language of extremes vs. boundaries by stating that the official NEPA language refers to studying “a reasonable range” of alternatives.

Public Comments

Marcia asked if anyone in the public would like to add comments. No public comments were offered.

Conclusion

To conclude the evening’s meeting, Marcia asked the CAG members to provide their input and thoughts on additional topics they would like to see addressed. The members provided the following suggestions for information that could be presented at future meetings:

- Michael Atkins stated that he would like to see more about the coordination efforts with AWV.
- Todd Vogel would like to see more information on multi-modal components of the facility and the project.
- Jo Thompson requested that she would like to see more information on how transportation will keep moving through the City once these projects begin.
- Paul Topper mentioned that he would like to see more information regarding potential funding opportunities. He cited Pier 48 as an example and inquired about WSF’s ability to acquire it from the Port of Seattle.
- John Hoffman would like to see examples of inspirational design in order to facilitate the development of motivational models.
- Mike Sudduth asked if more in-depth literature on the project and related components is available for the members to read in their free time.
- Gary Dawson mentioned that he would like to see more information about the interaction between Colman Dock and projects such as the seawall, waterfront redevelopment, and the AWV project.
- Conrad Plyler commented that a short WSF presentation during a Southworth Ferry Advisory Committee meeting would be well received by that group. He noted that just a quick update would go far in making the FAC feel informed.



- Frank Madigan stated that he would like to see more information on aligning strategic partners for public/private investment opportunities.
- Michael Berk raised concerns about the timing of other projects and the ability for the City, residents, and commuters to accommodate all of these activities.
- Heather Trim noted that the presentation of alternatives must remain transparent and meaningful with regard to the development of real choices for this project.
- Roger Ottenbach commented that he would like to have representatives from City and State agencies working on the AWV project attend the meeting so that they could hear and respond to the ideas of the CAG.
- John DeLanoy is interested in learning more about the opportunities for private/public partnerships and the proposed zoning changes.
- Darrell Bryan reiterated the importance of bringing together all involved agencies and parties to generate the appropriate funding necessary for an ambitious project.
- John Blackman reaffirmed the importance of coordinating the AWV and Colman Dock projects to try and mitigate impacts.

Mike Anderson closed the evening's meeting by thanking the CAG for their continued participation and stressed the important role that the CAG is playing with the project. He stated that more dialogue will occur with the CAG and in future meetings and that the issues regarding public/private partnerships will be brought to the CAG as they unfold.

Marcia thanked the CAG for the participation in the evening's meeting, and the second CAG meeting was concluded.